



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/516,774	06/27/2005	Frank Majewski	112740-1028	4669

29177 7590 11/30/2005

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD, LLC
P. O. BOX 1135
CHICAGO, IL 60690-1135

EXAMINER

LY, NGHI H

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2686

DATE MAILED: 11/30/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The information disclosure statement filed 12/03/04 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2), which requires a legible copy of each cited foreign patent document; each non-patent literature publication or that portion which caused it to be listed; and all other information or that portion which caused it to be listed. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered.

Form 1449/PTO, references under FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS fail to provide a legible copy of cited foreign patent document.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 9-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Regarding claims 9-15, the claims recite "*a logical AT-command-based interface*". Therefore, the claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in

the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5. Claims 9-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pecan et al (US 6,466,804) in view of Janssen et al (US 2003/0157929A1).

Regarding claims 9 and 13, Pecan teaches a method for implementing external access by a first mobile communication appliance to a subscriber identity module in a second mobile communication appliance (see fig.2, wireless connection between

Art Unit: 2686

wireless devices and see Abstract and column 3, lines 45-60). Pecen does not specifically disclose defining a logical AT-command-based interface between the first and second mobile communication appliances, and permitting, via the logical AT-command-based interface, logical autonomous communication between the first and second mobile communication appliances.

Janssen teaches defining a logical AT-command-based interface between the first and second mobile communication appliances (see [0044] and [0047]), and permitting, via the logical AT-command-based interface (see [0044] and [0047]), logical autonomous communication between the first and second mobile communication appliances (see fig.2, wireless connection 215 between two wireless device and see [0047], see "SIM").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teaching of Janssen into the system of Pecen in order to provide access to other information (see Janssen, [0047]).

Regarding claims 10 and 14, the combination of Pecen and Janssen further teaches the first and second mobile communication appliances contain a respective adaptation layer which adapts logical communication between the first and second mobile communication appliances to the logical AT-command-based interface (see Janssen, fig.2, wireless connection 215 between two wireless device and see [0047]).

Regarding claim 11, the combination of Pecen and Janssen further teaches the logical AT-command-based interface uses a client/server architecture (see Janssen, [005], [0032], [0044] and [0047]).

Regarding claims 12 and 15, the combination of Pecen and Janssen further teaches the logical AT-command-based interface is used independently of a transmission technology being used, the logical AT-command-based interface using one of RS-232, USB, Bluetooth, Wireless-LAN and Ultra-Wide-Band (Janssen, [0038], see "RS-232").

Regarding claim 16, Pecen further teaches wherein no subscriber identity module is used in the first mobile communication appliance (see fig.2, wireless connection between wireless devices and see Abstract and column 3, lines 45-60).

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

a. Sivula (US 6,907,239) teaches charging for telecommunications download services.

b. Hubbe (US 6,278,885) teaches mobile phone using subscriber identification card for updating information stored therein.

c. Kuriki (US 5,765,105) teaches communication system capable of using a plurality of subscriber identity media sharing a single subscriber identity information.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nghi H. Ly whose telephone number is (571) 272-7911. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 am-5:30 pm Monday-Friday.

Art Unit: 2686

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marsha Banks-Harold can be reached on (571) 272-7905. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Nghi H. Ly


11/21/05



**CHARLES APPIAH
PRIMARY EXAMINER**